

we cannot, I hope our leadership will keep us throughout the week until each of these vitally important initiatives has become the law of the land so we can go home and tell the American people we have started to change the course in which this country is going. We are shifting it to a better and more responsible and more responsive direction, but we need more than 2 years to make up for all of the follies of the last two to four decades. With that, I recommend the passage of this bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment on the pending legislation as we approach in the course of some 11 hours the end of the fiscal year at 12 o'clock midnight. We are faced with an appropriations process which I believe has severely undermined what we are supposed to be doing as legislators.

I just heard my distinguished colleague, Senator GORTON, make a comment about the price we are paying for what he considers to be extra appropriations on certain lines because we have not had an opportunity to consider the items in detail. I agree with him about that. My suggestion is we are paying even a higher price because we have not permitted the appropriations process to run its course because of the political differences and the very deterioration of our Senate process.

It was illustrated on the Interior appropriations bill where the majority leader had to take down the bill because of maneuvering—one side trying to gain an advantage on some politically popular items like education, something I have long supported in my capacity as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which deals with appropriations. Then the bill which I have the chairmanship of, Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education, was never brought to the floor because of insufficient time and because of the determination that the bill could not be enacted in due course.

Instead, we have come to a situation where everything is rolled into one omnibus appropriations bill, which is a take-it-or-leave-it proposition, with the alternative being to close down the Government. The procedural posture today is that there is a second measure which can come before the Senate which is the Department of Defense conference report where the omnibus appropriations bill has been rolled in, as well as the immigration bill, which would not even allow an opportunity for amendment during consideration of any of the individual items if that is to be called up as the order of the day.

It is my hope, Mr. President, when we reconvene for the 105th Congress, we will take a look and change the rules of the Senate to prohibit bringing up extraneous, nongermane matters on appropriations bills. If that were to be the case, when we consider Interior, it is an Interior bill alone. When we consider Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education, we then direct our at-

tention to that so we do not get into a situation where at the last minute we have no alternative but to say yes or no to such a massive bill. Or, when the extraordinary procedure is used of having a conference report, either to say yes or no without any amendment there.

I have spoken on this at some great length on Saturday, the day before yesterday, Mr. President, and at that time expressed my concern about a procedure which blurred the lines of separation of powers between the Congress, which is supposed to do the appropriations, then sending a bill to the President for his consideration, and a procedure in which the Chief of Staff, representing the executive branch, was party to negotiations with Congress before the bill was passed. This was an aberration, really a corruption, of the constitutional process of separation of powers, where each House acts, there is a conference, we send a bill to the President, and he makes the decision, signing or not, and then the Congress has the power to override.

What we have really seen, as I said at great length on Saturday, is a procedure where we have had the delegation of the President's authority to the Chief of Staff, with it being impossible for the President to know what was being agreed to on his behalf, again, I think, raising serious constitutional questions as to whether the President may delegate the authority in that way.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I now want to comment for a moment or two about one aspect of the appropriations process. That is the issue of foreign aid, which is tied into U.S. policy in the Mideast, and what is happening today in Israel and the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians, the PLO and the forthcoming summit with leaders from the Mideast, which is to be held in Washington tomorrow and the day after.

I commented on this issue on Saturday as well, Mr. President. It is my hope that the parties, Israel and the Palestinian Authority, will be able to work out their problems. They are now coming to Washington with additional leaders from the Mideast in an overtone which may suggest pressure on the parties, pressure specifically on Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu.

It is my view, Mr. President, that it is intolerable to have a situation where the Palestinians are firing on Israeli soldiers. The Palestinians are firing on Israeli soldiers with rifles and ammunition provided by the Israelis, pursuant to the Oslo Accords, so that the Palestinian police can contain the areas in Gaza and the other areas in which they have been given a limited amount of local authority. There was never any intention that those Palestinian police were to be an army to engage in what is, in effect, virtual warfare against the State of Israel.

This makes us pause as we see a demonstration of what might occur if the peace process goes forward and if there is great authority for the PLO, the Palestinian Liberation Organization, now known as the Palestinian Authority, as to what they may hope or seek to accomplish with a separate Palestinian state. That certainly is not part of the agreement on the Oslo Accords.

A few months after the signing on the White House lawn of September 13, 1993, I and others from this body went to take a look at what was happening, and we had a chance to meet with Chairman Arafat, had a chance to visit Jericho and Gaza, and we saw the flags of a Palestinian state which was already being assumed when the ink was barely dry on the Oslo Accords signed a few months earlier. That was not what was intended.

Now we have a de facto Palestinian state with a police force estimated between 30,000 and 40,000, which is a veritable army. That context, I submit, Mr. President, is simply an intolerable situation.

Going back to September 13, 1993, when I saw Arafat honored on the White House Lawn, it was a very, very difficult day considering that this was the man who was implicated in the murder of the United States charge in the Sudan in 1974. This is the man who was implicated in massive killings and terrorism against Israel. This is the man who led the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro* leading to the murder of Mr. Klinghoffer, who was pushed off the deck of the *Achille Lauro* in his wheelchair. It was pretty hard to sit on the White House Lawn and watch that man honored.

It seemed to me that if Prime Minister Rabin and then Foreign Minister Peres were willing to shake Arafat's hand, considering that Israel had suffered the most at the hands of PLO atrocities, then the United States ought to try to be helpful.

But now we see that a summit is planned. And, as this morning's press quotes, Arafat is betting that Prime Minister Netanyahu will come under pressure from President Clinton. If this is the case, I think it is time to rethink precisely what we are doing.

Israel voted for the Likud-Netanyahu government this past election expressing their concerns for security. It is very easy for people thousands of miles away from the locale to say, "Well, there ought to be pressure, and there ought to be in effect a determination, if not a dictation, as to what the Israeli elected officials ought to do."

It is my sense that Prime Minister Netanyahu can hold his own and make decisions for himself. But it is also my sense that there ought to be a statement made that the situation is intolerable with the Palestinians firing on Israeli soldiers, and that the United States ought not to exert pressure as to what the Israelis are to do in terms of their own security.

I had a chance to meet with Chairman Arafat last month in Gaza. And

when he asked about aid from the United States, I reminded him about the provisions of our law which require the Palestinian authorities to change the PLO charter before such aid will be granted. He brought me a document which simply said that all provisions of the charter inconsistent with the September 13, 1993, agreement were invalid, which hardly reaches the issue about the provisions of the PLO charter calling for the destruction of Israel. It was obviously insufficient.

Then there are the provisions of American law which call upon the Palestinian authorities to take strong steps against terrorism. I think they have not done that. The closing of the border is difficult with Romanians and others coming in to handle jobs in Israel. But when the open borders mean terrorism, and destruction of Israeli buses, it is not hard to understand why as a matter of security those borders are closed.

When I discussed with Chairman Arafat the issue of terrorism, he discussed Abu Nidal, somebody that he knows well—had known well—and Abu Abbas who was implicated in the *Achille Lauro* hijacking and is under a 30-year sentence in absentia from the Italian court. Chairman Arafat said that Abu Abbas raised his hand to change the PLO charter. Those are matters which require a lot of consideration as to just what may be expected of the Israeli Government in terms of trusting the PLO and trusting the Palestinian authorities.

Do the leopards change their spots? Here we have the Palestinian police firing on Israeli soldiers with guns and bullets provided by the Israelis.

So let us take a look at what we expect to be done. Certainly the matters ought to be subject to negotiation. But we really ought not to allow the Palestinian authority and Arafat to get what they want at the bargaining table by rioting and warfare.

(The remarks of Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the introduction of legislation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

OMNIBUS CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it appears that this afternoon we are going to be asked to vote on something in the form of an omnibus consolidated appropriations bill which may be attached to the Defense appropriations bill.

This is it, Mr. President. This is the 2,000-plus pages that have been put together and assembled since last Friday. I would suggest there is not one Member of this body who has read this. But

we go through that quite often and quite often we vote on things that we have not read in their entirety. But the reason that we are going to do this is because we on the majority side are somewhat held hostage. At least in the minds of many Members we are. We are talking about \$6.5 billion more that we are going to agree to spend to respond to the President's request for programs that he was not able to get funded during the normal process—\$6.5 billion with a "b", Mr. President. So we are talking about a major, major amount of expenditures.

All of this goes back to this horrible fear that we seem to be laboring under that—if we do not do this and we pass our appropriations bills, as we would normally do through the deliberative process, and the President vetoes these and we come to an impasse—the Government will stop at the end of the fiscal year which is taking place at this historic time right now, and that the Republicans would be responsible for it.

Last night I was watching a debate that took place wherein the distinguished minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, was talking about what happened when the Republicans shut down the Government. And I was waiting for a response because the Republicans did not shut down the Government. The Republicans only did those things that were responsible in the normal process that we live under here.

I remember so well in the other Chamber when the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, gave his State of the Union Message. And in that he had a very dramatic time during that 1 hour and 6 minutes—whatever it was—when he said, "And don't you ever shut down Government again," looking at us as if we were the ones who shut it down.

Well, anyway, apparently the vast majority of the American people believed that.

So, in fear for that and in responding to that, we are agreeing to fund a lot of his programs to the extent of \$6.5 billion, programs such as the Goals 2000 Program.

You know, a few years ago I came home. And at that time my son was in the fourth or the fifth grade. I can't remember. And he was just beaming. I said, "Jimmy, something good must have happened today." He said, "Well, you know, dad. I am in the fourth grade." I said, "Yes. I know that." He said, "Dad, you know that in reading I am in the fifth grade." I said, "How does that work?" He said it was a brand new Federal program. "It is a pilot program we are trying. It is a system that is set up where if you accelerate in a certain area that you can then compete with those who are in perhaps a grade or two above you."

I remember it so well back many years ago. I was in grade school. I was in the first grade. It was a little country school named Hazel Dell. And there were eight grades in one room. There

were eight rows. Back in those days, every time you missed a spelling word, you would walk up to the front of the class and they would swat you with a paddle. So I was a good speller, and I was in the first row because I was in the first grade. My brother was in the second row because he was in the second grade. My sister was in the eighth row because she was in the eighth grade. But every time they got around to me they had me sit over in the third row because I was a good speller.

Here is a brand new, innovative program that Government came up with here centralized in Washington. I would suggest to you that the Goals 2000 Program is one that has as its goalposts to bring the curriculum as close to Washington because our wisdom is so much greater here than it is out in the local areas. I do not agree with that. And yet what we are doing today, if we do—and I think it is going to happen—is we will extend the funding of that by \$255 million.

I see here that another \$87 million is going to go to EPA. Now, I am on the Environment and Public Works Committee. I can tell you that our effort with the Republican majority has been to stop some of this foolishness that comes out of Washington and have, for instance, real Superfund reform, Superfund reform where we would repeal retroactive liability, repeal joint and several liability, bring the remedies from the Federal Government back to the State. The average Superfund cleanup that is supervised by the Federal Government is something like 8½ years, and yet we have some that are being done, or proposals being made that if we can do it under local jurisdiction with everyone involved such as in Bossier City, LA, where one of the oil companies had actually had a cleanup—they admitted they were the responsible party, so they made a proposal to the State of Louisiana, and it was agreed to by the State of Louisiana, by the city of Bossier City, by all of the local officials, by all the consumer groups, by everyone they could get together to clean it up in a year and a half, and yet the EPA in Washington said no. Now we have got it reversed. But at first they said no, and so it would take another 8 to 9 years to do.

And so with this thrust that we are trying to get to bring the remedies and bring as much back to the local area, we find we are increasing EPA by \$87 million, and that is in addition to the \$170 million that the Agency received above the fiscal year 1996 levels.

So, first of all, we have increased them by \$170 million. Now we are increasing that by \$87 million. So all these programs where the people are upset Government is coming, the EPA, and saying you are guilty of messing up the Superfund site when you sold used crankcase oil 10 years ago to a licensed contractor; therefore, we are going to fine you, this kind of abuse of the responsible and law-abiding taxpayers is going to continue.